

REMARKS

This Amendment responds to the Office Action dated March 18, 2005. A diligent effort has been made to respond to the objections/rejections contained in this office action and reconsideration is hereby requested in view of the above claim amendments and these remarks.

Claims 1, 3-43, 51, 53, 57, 61-69, 81, and 84 have been cancelled. Pending claims 2, 47, and 70 have now been amended. New claims 85-89 are added for consideration.

The 112 rejection beginning at page 3 of the Office Action, and the corresponding statements regarding the Rule 131 Affidavit and the Priority claim, set forth at pages 2-3 of the Office Action have now been overcome by the present amendment. Specifically, the Office Action objected to the language “configuration file including encryption information specific to the mobile data communication device” present in claims 2 and 70 (and other claims which have now been cancelled) as not being supported by the earlier filed parent application. This language has now been removed from the claims and therefore the 112 rejection (and the statement regarding the priority claim) is overcome.

The 112 rejection of claims 57 and 81 at page 5 of the Office Action is now longer applicable as these claims have been cancelled.

The 112 rejection of claims 54, 55, 69 and 78-79 at page 6 is traversed. The Office Action states that “the specification makes it clear that the redirector program only runs on the host computer.” This is not correct. In the Summary of the Invention section of the application, at page 8, the following alternative location for the redirector program is disclosed: “Using this alternative configuration, one redirector program can serve a plurality of users. This alternative configuration could also include an internet- or intranet-based redirector program that could be accessible through a secure webpage or other user interface. The redirector program could be

located on an Internet Service Provider's system and accessible only through the Internet.” Thus, applicants maintain that the subject matter of these rejected claims is not new, is supported by the application as filed, and therefore the 112 rejection thereof should be withdrawn.

Regarding the 112 rejection of claims 75 and 76 at pages 6-7, these claims have now been amended to depend from claim 73, as suggested by the Office Action.

Turning finally to the section 103 rejections, applicants maintain that the present amendment to the claims overcomes these rejections. In addition, applicants maintain that the newly submitted claims distinguish over the prior art of record and therefore these claims are in condition for allowance.

The previously pending claims were rejected under section 103 as being obvious primarily over AirMobile, in view of Gehrmann, Nakata, and Picard. Although these rejections are specifically traversed, the presently amended claims clearly distinguish over these references. Claim 2, for example, has now been amended to recite the following limitation: “wherein the mobile data communication device is configured to receive messages from the wireless network and to determine whether a received message is a redirected message from the redirector component, and if the message is a redirected message, then the mobile communication device decrypts the redirected message using the decryption module prior to displaying it on a display of the mobile data communication device, and if the message is not a redirected message, then the mobile communication device immediately displays the message on the display.” This claim language is fully supported by the application at pages 25-27 describing the operations at the mobile device in Figure 5 of the application. As described and claimed herein, the mobile data communication device is configured to receive messages from the wireless network, and then to determine whether the message is from the redirector component, or from some other

information source. Messages from the redirector component are then subjected to processing by the decryption module prior to display, whereas the non-redirector messages may not be subject to such processing prior to display. This limitation is not disclosed or suggested by the references applied in the Office Action, and thus the claim is distinguishable over these references and the section 103 rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 70 includes similar language to claim 2 and therefore is allowable for the same reasons as claim 2.

New claims 85 and 89 describe a method and mobile device for use in conjunction with a redirection system. In these claims, the mobile device is able to determine whether a generated message is related to a redirected message received at the mobile device from the redirection system. If the message is so related, then the mobile device is configured to encrypt the generated message and to then transmit the generated message back to the redirection system, where the redirection system then decrypts the message and transmits it to a destination address. If the message is not related to a redirected message, then the mobile device transmits the generated message directly to the destination address without use of the redirection system. These claims are distinguishable from the art of record, in particular the art referenced in the Office Action, and therefore a notice of allowability is respectfully requested.

JONES DAY

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David B. Cochran", written over a horizontal line.

David B. Cochran
(Reg. No. 39,142)

North Point, 901 Lakeside Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
(216) 586-7029